



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tradition. The assumption that the legend of the Septuagint first came at so late a date from the imagination of the writer of Aristeas will commend itself to few who read the author's exposition of this view. No doubt in his next book Willrich will say of many of his present positions what he now says of some put forward in his earlier work, that they were held *sehr mit Unrecht*.

WARREN J. MOULTON.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL.

STUDIEN ZUR ENTSTEHUNGSGESCHICHTE DER JÜDISCHEN GEMEINDE NACH DEM BABYLONISCHEN EXIL. VON ERNST SELLIN. 2 Bände. Leipzig: Deichert, 1901. Pp. iv+302; iv+199. M. 10.

THE first of these studies, and by far the longer, as it occupies the whole of the first volume, is devoted to the identification of the Servant of Jehovah in the so-called Ebed-Yahweh passages of Deutero-Isaiah. The author had already dealt with this subject in his work *Serubbabel*, 1898, when he reached the conclusion that Zerubbabel was the Servant. Subsequent investigation, induced in part by the trenchant criticisms of his earlier work, have led him to modify his conclusions. In the book before us he goes over the ground most carefully, considering at each step the views of the most important recent writers on the subject, and step by step building up a theory which he hopes will prove acceptable to Old Testament scholars.

The first point to be settled is whether the Servant in the Servant passages, Isa. 42: 1-4; 49: 1-6; 50: 4-9; 52: 12-53: 13, is individual or collective. Here he decides most positively, and, as I think, correctly, in favor of the individual interpretation. The descriptions of the function and of the work of the Servant are so individualistic in their character, and he is so definitely distinguished from the people as a whole, and by his very anonymity in these passages stands out in such marked contrast from the people, that Budde's¹ brilliant argument has not persuaded me to adopt the collective view. The mention of Israel, Isa. 49: 3, is clearly a gloss, as is shown by the fact that it disturbs the meter and is difficult to construe (p. 16), while Budde's attempt to force Israel into the text of 52: 12 by reading *ישראל* for *ישכיל* can hardly be regarded as successful.

In his second chapter Sellin seeks to prove that the Servant is not a future nor yet an ideal person, but an actual contemporary of the

¹ AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, 1899, pp. 499-540.

author. Notwithstanding the ingenuity of his arguments, I must declare myself unconvinced. While it is probably true that some of the prophet's contemporaries may have furnished him with some of the details of his description, I cannot bring myself to the belief that any actual living man could have posed for the magnificent pen-pictures which these passages give us. Even if one makes all possible allowance for the poetical description, the idealist that the author of these passages was could no more have found his model in an actual contemporary than his great predecessor could have found the reality which he pictured, say in Isa. 9 : 5, 6, in any actual child.

With the contention of the next chapter, that the Servant is neither a prophet nor a teacher of the law, but a descendant of the house of David, who is to be the leader of the new kingdom of God, I find myself in substantial agreement, with the limitation, of course, that the conception of the Servant was not realized in any actual, living member of the Davidic house. It was no innovation to speak of David as servant rather than king (*cf.* 2 Sam. 7 : 4 ; 1 Kings 3 : 6, and other passages in the historical books). And more significant even than these references is Ezekiel's mention of the servant David (Ezek. 34 : 23, 24).

Inasmuch as the date of the Servant passages, their relation to Deutero-Isaiah, and the date of Deutero-Isaiah are important questions for the identification of the actual person whom Sellin supposes to be the Servant, he devotes the next two chapters to the consideration of these matters. With his conclusion, that Isa., chaps. 40-55, are from a single author, and that there is no good reason for denying the Servant passages to the same hand, I find myself in hearty agreement. But when he goes on to argue that chaps. 40-48 were published during the march of the Persian army against Babylon, and contains citations from the earlier work of Deutero-Isaiah, *e. g.*, 41 : 2-4 ; 46 : 10, 11, and that chaps. 49-55 were published after the occupation of the city and the proclamation of the general edict of restoration, but before the Jews had received their special edict, I can only say that, in my opinion, he goes beyond the evidence. His definition of the "former things" (ראשונות) and the "new things" (חדשות) in chaps. 40-48 is interesting, and, so far as the new things are concerned, he seems to me to make out a very strong case for the view that they are "the wonderful return of the people to their own land and the wonderful re-establishment of the kingdom of God" (p. 150). It may be a question whether his definition of the former things as "the prophecies of the victorious

career of Cyrus up the time of his march on Babylon" is not too narrow. That they are fulfilled prophecies is clear, but they need not all be prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah. The argument for the identity of authorship of the Servant passages and the rest of Deutero-Isaiah is strengthened in the opinion of Sellin by the discovery of the individual Servant outside of the Servant passages, *e. g.*, Isa. 42:5-7; 49:8, 9; 50:10, etc. Here, too, he seems to me to be in the main correct. But when he tries to find the individual Servant in 42:18-21, on the theory that the blindness and deafness of the Servant are not his fault but his misfortune, because he has been imprisoned and so made to walk in darkness, the argument seems to me strained and unconvincing.

The culmination of Sellin's argument is, of course, the identification of the Servant. After examining and rejecting the claims of various members of the Davidic house, he finally decides for Jehoiachin, whose release from prison by Evil-Merodach in 561 he regards as having given rise to a new outburst of the messianic hope. That Jehoiachin might have been living in the latter years of the exile cannot be denied, and that his fate may have furnished some of the features of the description of the Servant is equally possible; but, as I have already stated, no real member of the Davidic house could, in my opinion, have been the original of the Servant. Sellin himself regards it as possible that the Servant may be the Davidic house, while in the various descriptions now one and now another personality furnishes the principal details of the picture. If he had contented himself with this broader identification, he would have been nearer the truth.

The closing chapter of the study is devoted to some excellent remarks on the place which these Ebed-Yahweh passages occupy in the historical development of the Old Testament religion, in which he shows that the most strictly scientific historical interpretation of these passages not only does not hinder, but really favors, the recognition of their actual fruition in Jesus Christ.

The second study deals with the restoration of the Jewish community in the years 538-516. The various authorities for the period are carefully examined. Sellin's estimate of the historical value of Ezra 4:7-6:15 is even higher than that of Eduard Meyer in his *Entstehung des Judenthums*. It seems to me that very possibly he has furnished the clue for the correct interpretation of Ezra 4:7-23. As is well known, this passage deals with the building of the walls, not of the temple (4:12). This fact, together with the mention of the kings

Ahashuerus and Artaxerxes, has given occasion for unlimited speculation among historical critics. In agreement with Winckler, Sellin holds that the names of the Persian kings are probably not entirely in order, and he makes the very plausible suggestion that the restoration of the city mentioned here is that which would naturally be undertaken immediately after the return in 538. The record of this early attempt and its frustration is, in our present book of Ezra, taken from an Aramaic document sent from Jerusalem and Samaria to Artaxerxes by the opponents of Nehemiah, who sought, by this reference to the action of Cyrus or his immediate successor in regard to the building of the walls of Jerusalem, to recall the royal permission given to Nehemiah to rebuild the walls and thus to rehabilitate the city. Ezra 4: 7 is then the title or label of this fragmentary Aramaic document. Tabeel is the Tobiah of Nehemiah (*cf.* Neh. 2: 10), Mithredath is the Persian satrap, and Bishlam is not a proper name at all, but is to be read as a common noun with the preposition (*cf.* LXX, ἐν εἰρήνῃ), so "with the approval of Mithredath, wrote Tabeel, etc." The order of events then is: the temple edict of Cyrus; the return of Sheshbazzar and his laying of the foundation of the temple; gradual return of the exiles to Jerusalem; an attempt to build the walls frustrated by the machinations of the Samaritans; consequent cessation of work upon the walls and the temple; resumption of work on the temple, and its completion by Zerubbabel. This is practically the order of events as outlined in Ezra, chaps. 1-6, and I agree with Sellin in holding that there is no reason for rejecting the narrative of the earlier attempt to build the temple, and it seems to me that he shows most conclusively that the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah, when rightly interpreted, does not oppose the narrative in Ezra. Sellin holds that Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar are two distinct personages. Here I must confess that his arguments have not convinced me.

The novel feature in Sellin's discussion of the return is the interpretation which he puts upon the prophecy of Zechariah. He proposes the highly improbable theory that in his vision Zechariah transports himself into various past periods, *e. g.*, the Babylonian exile before the fall of Babylon; the first years of the return after Joshua had arrived, but before the arrival of Zerubbabel; and, most remarkable of all, the pre-exilic time for the fifth and sixth visions, when the declaration is made that the evil of the land is to be carried into Babylon, and then back again to the exilic period. In this way he develops and seeks to support his theory, not only that the return was

a gradual one — this is now very generally accepted — but that the prophecy of Zechariah enables us to mark at least three stages in that return: (1) that under Joshua, (2) that under the lead of Heldai and his associates, and (3), shortly before 520, that under the leadership of Zerubbabel. On this hypothesis the crown of Zech. 6: 11 was actually placed upon the head of Joshua in anticipation of the coming of the Branch — in other words, Zerubbabel: with the coming of Zerubbabel, according to Sellin, the great body of the exiles were once more in their own land, and consequently the dawn of the messianic era was regarded as at hand. The fact is that both Haggai and Zechariah show that not even in 520 was the work of restoration regarded as completed, and, while they had great hopes for the future after the rebuilding of the temple by Zerubbabel, they still looked to Babylon for further reinforcements, and recognized that the divine displeasure was still resting upon them. Sellin is also mistaken, as I think, when he adduces the lists in Ezra, chap. 2, and Neh., chap. 7, in support of his theory that the great body of the exiled had returned by 520. These are lists, not of the exiles who returned during these early years, but of the inhabitants of the province of Judea, in so far as these inhabitants consisted of returned exiles, and they come from the time of Nehemiah, and hence are without weight for this earlier period.

Sellin's argument that the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah support his view of the restoration is undoubtedly true for the main points of his view as against the interpretation of Kusters, but they by no means confirm his theory that the restoration was regarded as completed by the return of Zerubbabel. One is inclined to think that he emphasizes this point so strongly in order to make room for his theory with regard to the elevation and downfall of Zerubbabel which he set forth with so much ingenuity in his work on Zerubbabel, and the main outlines of which he still defends in the third study of the present work.

In his suggestion that Isa., chaps. 56–66, must have originated in Jerusalem during the years 536–520 Sellin seems to me to have made a contribution of real value toward the solution of the problem of the Trito-Isaiah. Indications of the age are not numerous in these chapters, but, as Sellin says, 63: 18; 64: 9, 10; 66: 1–5, find a natural explanation in the Samaritan hostilities of this period, and there is nothing in the section which cannot be explained out of the conditions during the early years of the restoration when the work so enthusiastically begun was so forcibly stopped. Sellin considers the question of the Deutero-Isaianic authorship of these chapters and

declines to do more than to admit its possibility. I am inclined to go farther and maintain that it is highly probable that these closing chapters of the book come from the same hand as the earlier chapters. The change in place and circumstances is no argument against this view, for it is only reasonable to assume that the man who did so much to prepare the people to take advantage of the permission to return would take part in the return when it became a reality, and would follow with the same zeal and interest the course of events during those cruel years of disenchantment and disappointed hopes.

Sellin concludes his review of the sources for this period with an estimate of the Chronicler, whom he regards as having in the main given his materials faithfully, his chief error being his identification of Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar. But, as I have already indicated, I am by no means convinced that it is not Sellin rather than the Chronicler who is in error here. It is not necessary to assume that Zerubbabel was not in Jerusalem in order to account for the attitude of the people during 536-520 and the change in public sentiment in 520. It is not at all unlikely that the courage of the people may have been stimulated by the new arrivals from Babylon. But the revolutions in the Persian empire attendant upon the accession of Darius, and the zeal of Haggai and Zechariah, are sufficient, it seems to me, to account for the reawakening of the messianic hope. And to whom else than Zerubbabel could that hope be directed?

Space will permit of no more than a mention of the third study, the "Fate of Zerubbabel." Suffice it to say that here Sellin seeks to collect the fragments of his earlier Zerubbabel hypothesis which he has himself done so much to shatter. He still maintains that there was an actual attempt to make Zerubbabel king, that this attempt was treated as an act of rebellion by the Persian government, that Zerubbabel was dethroned, and that the line of David was declared ineligible for the governorship. These events are regarded as having been the cause of the unhappy conditions in Jerusalem at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, or rather of Nehemiah and Ezra, as Kusters and Sellin arrange them. This is an ingenious hypothesis and may be true, but in my opinion it still awaits its proof.

The principal criticism which I should make upon the work as a whole is that it seems to me to be too much influenced by the exigencies of a theory. But, notwithstanding this, I am glad, in closing this notice, to record my sense of indebtedness to our author for many stimulating suggestions, and for some valuable contributions to our

understanding of this difficult and highly important period of Old Testament history.

WALTER R. BETTERIDGE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

FÜNF NEUE ARABISCHE LANDSCHAFTSNAMEN IM ALTEN TESTAMENT. Beleuchtet von EDUARD KÖNIG. Mit einem Exkurs über die Paradiesesfrage. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902. Pp. 78. M. 3.

KÖNIG's pamphlet is a critical review of some theories recently put forth by H. Winckler and F. Hommel. These two scholars believe to have discovered that in several cases names of Arabic tribes or countries and rivers occur in the Old Testament, where they have not been recognized before (*cf.* Winckler's studies on *Musri*, Berlin, 1898, and Hommel's *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, III, i, 8: "Vier neue Landschaftsnamen im Alten Testament," Munich, 1901). (1) The אַשּׁוּרִים, Gen. 25:3, are identified with אַשּׁוּר in a Minæan inscription of Ed. Glaser's; being a branch of דָּדָן, probably a north-Arabian tribe, they must be located somewhere in northern Arabia, not far from Edom. König accepts this combination, but rejects Hommel's further conclusions with regard to some other passages in the Old Testament, where this Ashshûr = אַשּׁוּר is said to be originally intended. (2) מִצְרַיִם is, according to Winckler and Hommel, in a great many cases not = Egypt, but = *Muṣrân* in north Arabia; furthermore is *Muṣrân* or *Moṣar* (*Maṣor*) = Midian according to Hommel. Without denying that *Muṣri* may have been intended in a few passages, König gives his reasons against the new explanation of most of these cases. (3) The מִצְרַיִם מִצְרַיִם or מִצְרַיִם נָהָר and even הַנָּהָר (usually thought to be the Euphrates) is with Hommel = Wâdi Sirhân. (4) כְּנָעַן, to be read *Kôṣ* or *Keṣôṣ* = a region and tribe in central Arabia. (5) The מֶלֶךְ אֲרִיבִי is the "king of Aribi."

In (3)-(5) König disapproves Hommel's views and argues against him, sometimes, as it seems to me, with truisms. In an appendix König treats of the question whether three of the four rivers of Paradise should be located, with Hommel, in Arabia, and he arrives at a negative decision.

König's peculiar style has been noted often enough (*cf.* recently Wellhausen in *Gött. Gelehrt. Anzeig.*, 1901, p. 739). Each writer has certainly his right of individuality, but for the sake of the German